DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 267 SP 037 251

AUTHOR Ariav, Tamar; Clinard, Linda McCorkel
TITLE Does Coaching Student Teachers Affect the Professional Development and Teaching of Cooperating Teachers? A Cross-Cultural Perspective.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Teacher Education (2nd, Netanya, Israel, June 30-July 4, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; College School Cooperation; Comparative Education; *Cooperating Teachers; *Cross Cultural Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development Schools; Reflective Teaching; *Student Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Student Relationship; Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Beth Berl College (Israel); Coaching for Improved Teaching; University of California Irvine

ABSTRACT

This study examined the perceptions of cooperating teachers who are coaching student teachers within Professional Development School (PDS) models in two cultures. Part of an action research project conducted by the University of California-Irvine (UCI) and Beit Berl College (Israel), the study examined: (1) what contributions the cooperating teacher provides to the preservice teacher and receives from collaborating with a preservice teacher in training and (2) whether the cooperating teacher's coaching role effects his/her own teaching and professional life. Data in the United States and Israel were gathered using the same methodology. Dialogue meetings were scripted and then content analyzed for emerging patterns and categories. A questionnaire was developed. The original questionnaire was completed by 58 California teachers in 1993-94 and a second version was completed by 19 Afek (Israel) teachers in 1994-95. The cooperating teachers in both California and Israel felt their contributions to the student teachers were significant. Israeli teachers emphasized seeing students as individuals first and instructional techniques second. American teachers emphasized classroom management, then instructional ideas. Only the American teachers reported that they themselves benefitted from interaction with preservice teachers. Versions of the questionnaire are appended. (Contains 26 references.) (LLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 409 267

DOES COACHING STUDENT TEACHERS AFFECT THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHING OF COOPERATING TEACHERS? A CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE*

Tamar Ariav, Beit Berl College, Israel
972-9-906459, ariavt@beitberl.ac.il

Linda McCorkel Clinard, University of California-Irvine
(714) 824-8359, lclinard@uci.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Ariav

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Paper presented at The Second International Conference
TEACHER EDUCATION: STABILITY, EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION
Israel, June 30-July 4, 1996
Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport
Department of Teacher Education
MOFET INSTITUTE

*This paper is dedicated to Maryjane Dwyer (1946-1995), a committed UCI University Associate.

SP027253

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DOES COACHING STUDENT TEACHERS AFFECT THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHING OF COOPERATING TEACHERS? A CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Tamar Ariav and Linda M. Clinard

Introduction

This study examines the perceptions of cooperating teachers who are coaching student teachers within Professional Development School (PDS) models in two cultures. It is part of a larger action research project conducted at the University of California-Irvine (UCI) and Beit Berl College-Israel (BBC). Specifically, this study shares insights gained from cooperating teachers in two areas: (1) What contributions do teachers provide to the student teacher and what benefits do they draw from collaborating with a teacher-in-training? (2) Does coaching have any effect on the teaching and professional life of the cooperating teacher?

As American and Israeli teacher educators who are working with PDS colleagues within our respective institutions, we are exploring the potential impact of coaching on mentors and the possible cultural nuances of this experience. While the main research goal was to examine the perceptions **within** each culture in order to further develop the PDS approach, another research goal was to share insights **across** countries which would benefit each program. Since the two teacher education programs differ considerably in their overall structure, comparisons would not be productive.

Theoretical Framework

The empowering potential of action research, the importance of collaboration and mutual learning through a Professional Development School model, and professional development through reflective practice provide the theoretical foundations for this study.

Collaborative action research is a viable methodology in which university researchers and teachers explore problems of practice in order to improve programs and instruction and to gain a better understanding of what they do (Oja and Smulyan, 1989). Some elements of collaborative action research are proposed by

Kemmis (1993) and Goswani and Stillman (1987): solution-oriented processes, self-reflection, improvement of one's own educational practices, and enhanced communication. In our study, cooperating teachers were involved in collecting data, analyzing data, and sharing perspectives. The purpose of the collaboration was to improve learning for both K-12 students and teachers of tomorrow.

Numerous reports and studies have advocated the importance of university/K-12 partnerships, in general, and the ideas of Professional Development Schools, in particular (Goodlad, 1990; Lieberman and Miller, 1990; Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988; Soder, 1988; The Holmes Group, 1986;). Those who document and share the challenges and triumphs of other PDS efforts provide us with helpful insights for developing such collaborations in our institutions (e.g., Bullough, et. al., 1996; Chase, et. al., 1996; Teitel, 1996; Brookhart and Loadman, 1992).

It is more apparent now than ever that school restructuring is strongly interrelated to the preparation and ongoing development of teachers (Lieberman and Miller, 1990). There is growing evidence that mutually-respectful dialogue among teachers, student teachers, and teacher educators provide insights which promote effective changes in the schools and in preservice education (Grimmett, 1996; Johnston, 1996; Anderson, 1993). Goodlad (1991) emphasizes this point by claiming that:

> *Virtually all the research on change since the previous era of such folly points to the power of school-based groups engaged in a process of renewal that is characterized by dialogue based on relevant data, decisions stemming from such dialogue, the implementation of the decisions, their subsequent evaluation, and the continuation of the dialogue. Such groups can reach out to draw on the research-based models of others. Moreover, this process is as relevant to curriculum planning in teacher education as it is in elementary and secondary schools.* (p. 313)

Another key theoretical concept inherent in this study is the emerging perspective of professional development and reflective thinking. The reflective practitioner has a tacit knowledge which needs to be acknowledged by teacher educators, as well as realized by the teachers themselves (Berliner, 1996). Teachers build on that knowledge base through ongoing inquiry and analysis, continually rethinking and evaluating values and practices (Schon, 1983; Lieberman and Miller, 1990). Responding to suggestions from PDS partners working with UCI, we have adopted

this platform using a modified version of Cognitive Coaching (Costa and Garmston, 1994). This approach promotes reflection, self-inquiry, and non-judgmental feedback, and views coaching as a strategy which facilitates mutual learning. It was applied in our study by cooperating teachers (University/College Associates) in the process of coaching student teachers.

Changes in the role of cooperating teachers in PDS networks have been described recently (e.g., Ungaretti, et al. 1996; Lee and Wilkes, 1996; Anderson, 1993), and many states have initiated teacher mentor programs (e.g., Magliaro, 1994). In Israel, the Ministry of Education has recently encouraged the colleges of teacher education to develop mentor programs on campus.

Despite the fact that the mentoring phenomenon has been examined extensively (e.g., Winograd, et. al., 1995; Enz, 1992; Grippin, 1991), little attention has been given to the influences that mentoring might have on mentors. It is assumed by some that mentors benefit from working with novices (Clement, 1996). They feel rewarded professionally when their schools choose them to be mentors, and they feel rejuvenated from working with enthusiastic new teachers. However, it seems that such assumptions have not been directly examined and that they are considered as common- sense beliefs. Most studies on cooperating teachers overlook them as individuals who could benefit or be negatively affected by their new role. We are examining these potential effects on the cooperating teacher as a teacher in the classroom, as a professional educator and as a private person.

The personal perspective we address seems important because it might help us understand a teacher's perception of "what's in it for me and my students?" What do cooperating teachers professionally and privately take from the coaching process? This perspective is especially crucial when considering the impact of school-university collaboration on school renewal and on the improvement of teaching and learning. If the new clinical role of the cooperating teachers has no effect on their life and practice, then the idea of PDS might be short-lived.

Background of the Study and Early Insights

Initiation by UCI

The UCI/PDS model was initiated in 1991-92 with one school for the fifth-year elementary and secondary credential programs. The future vision of student teacher/cooperating teacher roles was developed together by the UCI faculty and school administrators and teachers during 1992-93, a year which focused on building trust and communication among the K-12 educators and university partners. The initial 'vision statements' developed collaboratively included the following recommendations:

1. Cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship needs to be coaching side-by-side.
2. UCI and local districts should work together in training of cooperating teachers.
3. Student teaching orientation should be held at school sites and involve cooperating teachers, student teachers, and university faculty.
4. Clear expectations of cooperating teachers should be developed and distributed.
5. The culture of the school needs to celebrate the concept of "Student Teachers".
6. Exposure to high-quality cooperating teachers is needed.
7. Improve the dialogue between university and local districts in the selection, preparation, and support of cooperating teachers and student teachers.

The early development of the UCI/PDS network is described by Clinard and Roosevelt (1993). UCI's network is composed of 55 PDS sites in eight Orange County school districts (with an average of 43 participating schools per year). The major changes implemented between 1992-1995 include:

(a) regular meetings with UCI faculty and PDS representatives;
(b) more diverse and expanded pre-student teaching fieldwork experiences;
(c) student teacher orientations together with cooperating teachers;
(d) collaboration in determining assessment standards for student teacher performance;
(e) creation of a Staff Development Liaison (SDL) role at UCI to facilitate communication, networking and preparation of cooperating teachers by using Cognitive Coaching strategies;
(f) changing the university supervisors' role to that of University Methods Advisor (UMA); and
(g) changing the cooperating teacher's role and the title to University Associate (UA).

The preparation process for change in the UA role included Cognitive Coaching seminars and workshops, planning meetings, and support dialogues approximately once a month facilitated by Linda (the SDL). University Associates met regularly in school-based clusters to reflect upon their coaching experience, share ideas, solve problems, brainstorm and talk. Hence, the role of the UA evolved slowly.

Initiation by BBC

Tamar, a BBC teacher educator and visiting scholar at UCI in 1993-94, joined Linda and UCI/PDS partners in the planning, design, and initial implementation of the action research project. Upon returning to Israel, she proposed most of the ideas described above to the BBC administration who supported a pilot project at Afek Elementary School beginning in the Fall, 1994. A decision was made that the pilot in this four-year teacher college would include a group of freshman elementary school student teachers.

The BBC/PDS program was proposed and then adopted by the Afek administration and teachers. There was little time for negotiations with the school staff about the BBC/PDS project, but the Afek principal was very interested in this new dimension of staff development. The project received neither official acknowledgment nor financial assistance from the Ministry of Education in Israel, because it was not congruent with the Ministry's efforts to prepare cooperating teachers in courses on-campus. The local school district expressed minor interest in the project despite efforts by Tamar and the principal to elicit more involvement and support.

Tamar focused as BBC/PDS Staff Development Liaison on seminars and dialogues which prepared and supported cooperating teachers in their new role of coaching student teachers. Chaya, an elementary principal, was released two days a week from her school to co-teach the general curriculum and pedagogy class with Tamar. Chaya served as advisor to the student teachers one day a week at Afek. The close planning and interaction between Tamar and Chaya served as a link of on-going communication between the cooperating teachers, the student teachers, and Staff Development Liaison. Tamar provided feedback to the college about the development of the pilot.

UCI/BBC Collaboration

The UCI/BBC collaborative research project focusing on the perceptions of cooperating teachers began in 1993-94 two years after the initiation of the PDS program at UCI. This year was dedicated to initial design, development of research tools, and initial implementation at UCI. The BBC/PDS study has been conducted since 1994-95 with Afek Elementary School. In this paper, we focus on the 1994-95 segment of the project which was UCI's second year and Beit Berl's first year of the study. While teacher participation in this action research and the teacher education programs differed substantially between the U.S. and Israel, (192 in the U.S. in 1994-95; 18 teachers in Israel), both UCI and BBC cooperating teachers have been introduced to the same philosophy and student teacher/cooperating teacher Cognitive Coaching process.

The UCI teachers were composed of small teams from each PDS school where teacher candidates completed approximately 20-weeks of student teaching between January and June in the one-year post baccalaureate certification program. The BBC pilot approach of "full immersion" required working with the entire faculty. The first-year student teachers completed their field experience at Afek one day a week between November and June.

Methodology

The action research project collected data on many facets of the changing role of cooperating teachers. This paper focuses on two aspects related to coaching students teachers: (1) What contributions did the teacher provide to the student teacher, and what benefits did the teacher draw from collaborating with a teacher-in-training? (2) Has coaching had any effect on the teaching and professional life of the cooperating teacher?

Data in the U.S. and Israel were gathered using the same methodology. Dialogue meetings were scripted and then content analyzed for emerging patterns, categories, and further questions. Informal conversations and contacts among the cooperating teachers, the principals, and the university faculty also provided important data. A questionnaire was developed using items which corresponded to categories identified in the data from the various sources. Answers to questions from each year were introduced as choices in the questionnaire the next year.

The first version of the questionnaire was given to 172 California teachers in 1993-94 and to 18 Afek Elementary teachers in 1994-95 (See Appendix A.). Fifty-eight percent of the 172 American cooperating teachers completed the questionnaire with 67% Elementary (Multiple Subject UA's) and 49% Secondary (Single Subject UA's). These responses were used to form UCI's 1994-95 questionnaire which was distributed to 192 California teachers (See Appendix B.). An equal number (59%) of elementary and secondary American teachers responded to the second version. The first version of the questionnaire was administered in Israel in 1994-95 with a response rate of 33%. The reason for administering the first version of the questionnaire, which contained open-ended questions, was to elicit genuine answers that reflect the Israeli milieu and not to direct the teachers' thinking toward ready-made options generated in the U.S.

Data from UCI 1993-95 and BBC 1994-95 were entered into a qualitative database which allowed us to organize the data, quantify some findings, and access specific aspects of the documentation. It is important to note that while the raw data from the dialogues and coaching seminars helped develop the questionnaire, they were also useful in the analysis and interpretation of the questionnaire responses.

Cross-Cultural Discoveries

Contributions to Student Teachers

UCI and BBC cooperating teachers clearly identified contributions which they provided to the student teachers which are summarized in Table 1

.....Insert Table 1 here.....

Mentors in the U.S. and Israel think that their contribution to the student teacher is significant. In Israel, they appeared to focus more on seeing students from a personal point of view and being attentive to their needs, then came instructional ideas and techniques, as well as reflection. In the U.S., mentors emphasized more classroom management/discipline techniques and then instructional ideas and reflection. The suggestions are similar across cultures, but their order of significance is different. Comments from the UCI questionnaires illuminate the contribution which cooperating teachers perceive they offered the student teachers:

- *Through our constant discussions, we discussed <u>everything</u> listed and more. All discussions were intertwined and effective.*
- *The area needing the most dialogue was the classroom management but became less frequent as the year progressed.*

<u>Contributions to the Cooperating Teacher</u>

Mentor's perceptions of student teacher contributions to cooperating teachers as expressed on the questionnaire are seen in Table 2:

....Insert Table 2 here..

The American cooperating teachers identified a number of areas in which they learned or changed through the interaction with student teachers. They offered specific comments such as the following:

- *It is extremely valuable to have another teacher give you feedback and insights after having spent so much time observing. An experienced teacher needs to be able to invite this feedback.*
- *She gave me ideas on the latest research and techniques taught in her classes [in the university].*
- *It was very insightful for me to sit in the back of the classroom and observe my children. It gave me a completely different perspective about their personalities.*

The Israeli mentors generally said that this interaction did not contribute to them as teachers. The Afek teachers who offered examples of contributions on the questionnaire appeared to focus on more tangible assistance provided through working with students in the classroom. However, comments documented during this final 1994-95 Afek/BBC meeting shed other insights:

> *I had student teachers this year who were third year students from another teachers college and first year student teachers from Beit Berl. I would not have liked those from the other college to teach my own children. The student teachers from Beit Berl knew to do things that the third year student teachers didn't know, i.e., What is a curriculum framework? How do you interpret it and put it into practice? It is more than what I knew to do and more than what the other student teachers knew. When I was a student*

teacher, I didn't work the way Beit Berl is working. The fact that the student teachers arrive and they know what to ask for makes me appreciate them more.

Influences IN the Classroom

We heard teachers during the dialogues share that the involvement in the coaching experience influenced them. Our interest was to identify more precisely these areas of influence within the context of a PDS model. Cooperating teachers were asked about the influence of the coaching experience on their lives **in** the classroom and **beyond**.

One Israeli teacher commented, "Learning different types of observation tools as they were presented in the cooperating teachers' seminar influenced my professionalism, especially in my ability to observe the involvement of children in a whole-group activity." The other Israeli teachers did not appear to describe in the questionnaire ways in which the coaching experience influenced their work as teachers in their own classes, yet the following insightful statement was made at the summative meeting in June, 1995:

I learned from this experience about myself. I did reflection on myself. I had two student teachers, and this reflection process contributed to me.

UCI/PDS cooperating teachers identified areas in which their work in their own classroom was influenced by the coaching experience (Table 3). Out of the 108 UCI respondents only three responded that there was no spillover of the coaching process to their own work as teachers in the classroom.

...Insert Table 3 here.....

UCI cooperating teachers provided some interesting comments:

- *This experience continues to influence my teaching which does the most significant thing -help the students.*
- *Being a UA this year definitely made me more reflective about myself.*
- *I needed to listen ...I'm so used to talking!*

Influences BEYOND the Classroom

During the June, 1995, BBC/PDS summative meeting, one teacher commented that Cognitive Coaching helped her a lot when working with colleagues in the school. However, most BBC cooperating teachers in the summative dialogue meeting and on the questionnaire said that they were not influenced beyond the classroom through the coaching experience.

UCI cooperating teachers identified areas in which the coaching experience affected their professional and personal lives beyond the classroom (Table 4).

...Insert Table 4 here....

Some interesting comments provided in the questionnaires were:

- *This program provides the forum for discussion that is often not available with fellow staff at our school. It functions as a collegial, supportive environment between the University staff, student teachers and UA.*

- *I have been involved in teacher action research and believe in its value. Working with research benefits teachers. For teachers not previously involved, having a student teacher affects all of the above.*

Summary and Lingering Questions

It appears that cooperating teachers in the U.S. and Israel can easily identify their contributions to the student teacher. In Israel, cooperating teachers appeared to focus more on seeing students from a personal perspective and being attentive to their needs, while in the U.S., mentors emphasized more classroom management techniques. Both Israeli and American mentors emphasized instructional ideas, teaching techniques, and reflection as contributions which they provided to student teachers. They identified contributions which are similar across cultures, but the order of significance differed. It seems that cooperating teachers have a clear opinion of what they give student teachers.

Regarding student teachers' contributions to their work, American mentors identified a number of areas in which they learned or changed through the interaction with student teachers: self-esteem, professional pride, and professional activities that are not directly related to classroom instruction. In general, the Israeli

teachers did not identify specific contributions of student teachers to them nor did they specify areas in which they were influenced in the classroom and beyond. Nevertheless, they expressed support for the new approach of sharing the responsibility for student teachers with the College, but identified two major obstacles to this process in portions of the questionnaire not addressed in this paper and in a June, 1995, dialogue: (1) Lack of time to implement the Cognitive Coaching cycle with student teachers and/or to communicate with the College faculty; (2) The student teacher's one-day a week schedule hindered continuous communication, planning, and reflection.

Perceptions expressed by American and Israeli teachers may be explained by socio-cultural background experiences, as well as by the concepts identified in the following three broad questions which we propose for future exploration:

1. How does **time** for building trust and developing collaborative dialogue affect the perceptions of cooperating teachers participating in PDS partnerships? (UCI's pilot year with one school and an additional year for planning and implementation with future PDS's provided substantial time to focus on building trust and establishing communication links before beginning the collaboration and changing roles among student teacher, cooperating teachers, and university faculty methods advisors. BBC's collaborative relationship with one school began without the preparation time for building communication links and mutual trust.)

2. How do **structure** and **size** of programs affect teachers' perceptions? (UCI's 5th year, full-time credential program with approximately 100 students has been fully engaged in working in an average of 43 K-12 PDS's annually. This differs considerably from BBC's 4-year teacher education program with approximately 3800 students in which only one group of thirteen first-year elementary department students participated in this project within one PDS .)

3. What similar and/or different **experiences** do college/university faculty, students, and cooperating teachers bring to the collaborative process which affect perceptions of participants? (For example, BBC and UCI cooperating teachers work within very different educational systems and

environments which impact the global context in which they live, but individual teachers share similar goals related to meeting the needs of the students in their classrooms.)

Two additional questions for further consideration are related to the collaborative approach which is pivotal in the BBC/PDS and UCI/PDS programs:

A. Is **mutual learning** between cooperating teachers and student teachers an essential element for both the growth of the student teacher and the professional development of the cooperating teacher? If so, what would enhance mutual learning between them? Mutual learning is a key concept of Cognitive Coaching which is the methodology we adopted for reflective thinking; however, is it possible that good coaching takes place without mutual learning?

B. Is it reasonable to expect that the coaching of student teachers alone would impact the **cooperating teacher's own practices and professional/personal growth**? What other aspects of the PDS collaborative relationship would further improve both the quality of K-12 and teacher education?

EDUCATIONAL IMPORTANCE

The May, 1995, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Program Evaluation provided strong support for the content and collaborative process of the UCI/PDS model:

> *The committee commends UCI for its commitment to the effective collaboration with its Professional Development Schools. District personnel, site administrators, and University Associates all praised the efforts of the university in building a meaningful partnership with the schools. The direct result of this partnership is an outstanding support system that serves the student teachers and the University Associates (formerly Cooperating Teachers). An important residual effect of the partnership is the increased sense of professionalism that the school site personnel feel from their collaboration with the university. As one assistant principal stated, 'there is a sense of professionalism overall on campus because of our relationship with the university.' Because Professional Development School staff were consulted*

> ***from the beginning of this model, they feel empowered and view themselves as trusted partners. The result of this is a collaborative relationship unique in public education.*** (Tremain, et. al., 1995)

Tamar has experienced in Israel that there is less awareness of the importance of school-college collaboration. The BBC/PDS project, for example, could not get funding for this type of a partnership. The challenge remains for the Ministry of Education and the local school districts to acknowledge and support school/college partnerships which focus on improving K-12 and teacher education.

A further challenge remains to continue to explore how the UCI and BBC insights and experiences can be effectively shared among the participants from both countries, as well as other settings and cultures. A priority of the researchers continues to be to recognize that any institution should not feel the obligation to replicate what is happening in one culture to make it fit into another. Analysis of additional data collected in 1995-96 remains to be examined with cooperating teachers with the anticipation that it would shed new light on the initial findings discussed in this paper.

Table 1

University/College Associate Contributions to Student Teacher

UCI 1994-95	Order of Significance	BBC 1994-95
Classroom discipline, behavior management strategies	*(1)*	*Recognizing differences, individualized instruction, differential curriculum planning*
Ideas for lessons/units	*(2)*	*Use of manipulatives*
Supportive feedback, "reflective mirror" without fear of failure	*(3)*	*Psychological, sociological understanding of students*
Flexibility/adaptability	*(4)*	*Lesson planning*
Insights into students' background, cognitive development	*(5)*	*Time planning*
Organization, record-keeping, time management techniques/ tools	*(6)*	*Reflective mirror (Helped student teacher self-evaluate.)*
Assessment strategies	*(7)*	*Planning unit, modeling teaching, designing worksheets.*
Alternative instructional theories/ styles (pedagogical deliberations)	*(8)*	
Understanding of school climate and culture	*(9)*	
Use of materials and media	*(10)*	
Grouping techniques	*(11)*	
Social and affective issues	*(12)*	

Table 2

Student Teacher Contributions to University/College Associate

UCI 1994-95	Order of Significance	BBC 1994-95
Enthusiasm	*(1)*	*(Half said, "Nothing")*
Opportunity to collaborate, team teach	*(2)*	*Designed learning centers*
Innovative strategies for teaching	*(3)*	*Assisted students with enrichment topics*
Reflective mirror (Helped UA reflect and self-evaluate current strategies.)	*(4)*	*Helping the students; paying attention to students*
Knowledge of subject matter	*(5)*	
Technology expertise	*(6)*	
Insights about individual student's background, behaviors...	*(7)*	
Assessment strategies	*(8)*	
Updated psychological understanding of students	*(9)*	

Appendix A

UCI 1993-94/BBC 1994-95 Questionnaire Items

The following items are a segment of the first version of the questionnaire:

Item 1: Please list specific contributions you and your UCI Student Teacher exchanged this year.

1a, One or two University Associate contributions to Student Teacher:

1b. One or two Student Teacher contributions to University Associate:

Item 2: Which aspects of your training and experience as a University Associate have influenced your work as a teacher in your own classes? Please provide examples.

Item 3 How has our involvement with the UCI process as a University Associate had an impact upon you as a professional beyond the classroom?

Appendix B
UCI 1994-95 Questionnaire Items

UCI responses from the items in Appendix A shaped the development of the second version of the questionnaire. Below are the three corresponding items which are a portion of the second version:

Item 1. Please specify contributions you and your student teacher exchanged this year.

1a. Check the University Associate contributions you provided to student teacher then number the THREE (1-3) most significant with 1= Most Significant.

___• *Assessment strategies*
___• *Ideas for lessons/units*
___• *Classroom discipline, behavior management, cognitive development*
___• *Insights about students' background, cognitive development*
___• *Organization, record-keeping, time management techniques/tools*
___• *Flexibility/adaptability*
___• *Supportive feedback, "reflective mirror? without fear of failure*
___• *Use of material and media*
___• *Grouping techniques*
___• *Understanding of school climate and culture*
___• *Social and affective issues*
___• *Alternative instructional theories/styles (pedagogical deliberations)*
___•_____
___•_____
COMMENT:

1b. Check student teacher contributions to University Associate which you experienced then number the THREE (1-3) most significant with 1= Most Significant.

___•*Enthusiasm*
___•*Innovative strategies for teaching*
___•*Technology expertise*
___• *"Reflective mirror" (Helped UA reflect and self-evaluate current strategies)*
___• *Insights about individual students' background, behaviors...*
___• *Opportunity to collaborate, team teach*
___• *Assessment strategies*
___•*Knowledge of subject matter*
___• *Updated psychological understanding of students*
___•_____

COMMENT:

2. Check concepts which were part of your training and/or experience as a University Associate which influenced your work as a teacher in your own classes, then number the THREE (1-3) most significant with 1 = Most significant.

___•*Encouraged self-reflection*
___•*Clarified own goals*
___• *Identified "evidence" of performance in classroom*
• *Used non-judgmental feedback*
___•*Collaboration/teamwork*
___• *Questioning strategies*
___•*Use of more innovative instructional approaches*
___•*Observation techniques and data collection (documentation skills)*
___• *Listening skills*
___•_____

COMMENT:

3. Check areas in which your involvement in the UCI process as a University Associate have had an impact upon you as a professional beyond the classroom then number the THREE most significant with 1 = Most significant.

___•*Sense of professionalism*
___•*Relationships-listening and talking-with others.*
___•*Networking with other educators*
___• *Providing staff development, education, training to other educators*
___•*Leadership roles*
___•*Professional organization involvement*
___•*Appreciation of my own strengths as a teacher*
___•*Being validated by others*
___•*Gaining respect from university professors*
___•*Exposure to/involvement in research*
___•_____

COMMENT:

Table 3

UCI/UA's Rank Order of Areas in Classroom Work Influenced by Coaching Experience

Order of Significance	Areas Influenced
(1)	Encouraged self-reflection
(2)	Used non-judgmental feedback
(3)	Collaboration/teamwork
(4)	Clarified own goals
(5)	Use of more innovative instructional approaches
(6)	Observation techniques and data collection
(7)	Identified "evidence" of performance in classroom
(8)	Questioning strategies
(9)	Listening skills

Table 4

Rank order of Areas that Impacted UA's Beyond the Classroom

Rank	Area "Beyond the Classroom"
1	Appreciation of my own strengths as a teacher
2	Sense of professionalism
3	Networking with other educators
4	Relationships--listening and talking with others
5	Providing staff development...to others
6	Being validated by others
7	Exposure to/involvement in research
8	Leadership role
9	Professional organization involvement
10	Gaining respect from university professors

REFERENCES

Anderson, Raymond C. (1993) Voices of Change: a Report of the Clinical Schools Project. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Berliner, David. (1996) Teaching as a reflective practice: Implications for teacher education. Keynote Address. The Second International Conference TEACHER EDUCATION: STABILITY, EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Brookhart, Susan M. and William E. Loadman. (1992) School-university collaboration: Across cultures. Teaching and Teacher Education. 4 (2), 53-68.

Bullough, Robert V., Jr., Don Kauchak, Nedra A. Crow, Sharon Hobbs, and David Stokes. (1996) Professional Development Schools: Catalysts for Teacher and School Change. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Chase, Sue, Merry Merryfield, and Ed Chism. (1996) Bridging the Gap Between Campus and School Through Collaboration in a Professional Development School Network in Social Studies and Global Education. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Clement, Mary C. (1996). How to establish a mentor program. Tips for Principals/from NASSP. April.

Clinard, Linda McCorkel and Mary Roosevelt. (December, 1993) New directions in K-12/university partnerships. Didactics. Irvine: University of California, Department of Education.

Costa, Arthur L. and Robert J. Garmston. (1994) Cognitive Coaching: A Foundation for Renaissance Schools. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Enz, Billie J. and Susan J. Cook. (1992) Student teachers' cooperating teachers' perspective of mentoring functions: Harmony or dissonance? Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Goodlad, John I. (1990) Teachers for Our Nation's Schools. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Goodlad, John I. (Dec. 1991) A study of the education of educators: One year later. Phi Delta Kappan. v.__, pp. 311-316.

Grimmett, Peter P. (1996) Restructuring and the struggle for energy and hope in teacher education: A call for reconceptualization of practice. Keynote Address. The Second International Conference TEACHER EDUCATION: STABILITY, EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION, MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Grippin, Pauline C. (1991) Intern mentors: Is this an idea worth pushing? Paper presented at The Annual Meeting Conference of the Northeastern Educational Research Association, Ellenville, New York.

Holmes Group (1986) Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group.

Johnston, Marilyn. (1996) Collaboration in teacher education: Unexpected outcomes. Keynote address, The Second International Conference TEACHER EDUCATION: STABILITY, EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION, MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Lee, Shirley and June Wilkes. (1996) Mentoring models and the role of cooperating teachers: New roles and responsibilties: Implications for continuing professional development. Paper presented at The Second International Conference TEACHER EDUCATION: STABILITY, EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION, MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Lieberman, Ann and Lynn Miller (1990) Teacher development in professional practice schools. Teachers College Record, 92 (1), pp. 105-122.

Magliaro, Susan G., Ruth Anne Niles, Terry W. Wildman, Dawn C. Walker, and Janice S. Maddex. (1994) Mentor programs: Challenges, changes, and chances for professional development in the '90's. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Oja, Sharon Nodie and Lisa Smulyan. (1989) Collaborative Action Research: A Developmental Approach. New York: The Falmer Press.

Schon, Donald. (1983) The Reflective Practitioner. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A. and John I. Goodlad. eds. (1988) School/University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns. New York: Teachers College Press.

Soder, Roger. (Dec. 1988) Studying the education of educators: What we can learn from other professions. Phi Delta Kappan. v. ___, pp. 299-305.

Teitel, Lee. (1996) Separations, Divorces, and Open Marriages in Professional Development School Partnerships. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association, New York.

Tremain, Jean, Ronald W. Solorzano, Bill Rice. (1995) Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Evaluation Team Report. Irvine: University of California. May.

Ungaretti, Toni, Lenore Cohen, Ralph Fessler, Judy Johnstone, and Rochelle Clemson (1996) Collaborative Professional Development School Partnerships: Revolution in the Evolution of Teacher Education. Symposium at The Second International Conference TEACHER EDUCATION: STABILITY, EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION. MOFET Institute, Israel. June 30-July 4.

Winograd, Ken, Karen Higgins, Barbara McEwan and Lance Haddon. (1995) Relinquishing field supervision to the mentors: University teacher educators rethink their practice. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.